

Application No. 10/761,162
Amendment dated 8/3/05
Reply to Office Action of 5/3/05

Amendments to the Drawings:

In Figure 1, the bottom left occurrence of numeral 54 has been changed to 53.

In Figure 4b, the left-most occurrence of numeral 30 has been changed to numeral 38.

In Figure 5, numeral 110 has been changed to numeral 110a, numeral 130 has been changed to numeral 130a, and numeral 30 has been changed to numeral 30a.

In Figure 6, numeral 32 has been changed to 33 and a new numeral 32 and its lead line have been added.

Application No. 10/761,162
Amendment dated 8/3/05
Reply to Office Action of 5/3/05

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 3, 2005 and is due on or before August 3, 2005.

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 – 13 remain in this application. Claims 7, 14 – 16 have been withdrawn.

Amendments were made to figures 1, 4b, 5 and 6. Formal drawings will be submitted in a separate letter.

In regard to the prior art, Claims 1-3, 9 and 10 were rejected as anticipated by Pelz USP 5,051,021. Claims 1 and 4 – 6 were rejected as anticipated by Struck USP 3,626,556. Claims 1, 5, and 8 were rejected as anticipated by Dunn USP 4,866,900.

Applicant notes with appreciation that Claims 11-13 were noted as having allowable subject matter.

In regard to the rejection in view of Pelz, applicant wishes to note Pelz does not include a "resilient blocking member" as recited in the original Claim 1; original Claim 1, however, has been amended. Also, the plate of the present invention is placed over a fastener, Pelz, however, seems to work in the reverse manner and does not anticipate Claim 1. Further, in regard to Claims 2 and 3, element 9 of Pelz is a semi-circular elevation and appears to operatively lift Pelz' grasping device 4 and does not appear to operate as a motion stop as recited in the original Claims 2 and 3.

Struck departs from the present invention in that he teaches a latch means 31, which includes a blocker 60, which is pivoted relative to a plate as well as to an end of another portion of the latch means; Struck does not teach the use of a resilient bridge spanning and secured to sides of a plate as recited in amended Claim 1. Further, Struck's plate 30 is secured within a retaining tab 54 on one end of the latch means.


Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 8 over Dunn is also respectfully requested. Dunn shows a system for making a grid for installing ceiling tiles or panels. Dunn's cross-member 13 does not "bridge" two sides of a single web [piece] 14 in the context of the present invention. It is not clear if Dunn teaches the use of a resilient member and this is not recited in Dunn; and Dunn's cross-member 13 does not

Application No. 10/761,162
Amendment dated 8/3/05
Reply to Office Action of 5/3/05

move with his web 14 as recited in the present Claims. Dunn's web is first installed and the cross-member secured thereto.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Markell Seitzman
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905
(586) 726-4172 (fax)